



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/123,633	07/28/1998	LEONARD E. MESS	11675.168	5760

22901 7590 12/18/2002

GREGORY M. TAYLOR  
WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY  
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER  
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VINH P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2829

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/123,633

Applicant(s)

MESS, LEONARD E.

Examiner

VINH P NGUYEN

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-15 and 39-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2,4,6-15,39-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Claims 49 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 52, it is unclear what "a control module" and "an electronic game assembly" represents. Are they shown in any of drawings?

2. Claims 49-50 and 52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It appears that the original specification does not have support for the limitations of "the electric apparatus selected from the group consisting of a computer, a program logic controller, an electronic game assembly, a controlling module, and a testing apparatus" as recited in claims 49-50 and 52.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features of a computer, a program logic controller, an electronic game assembly, a controlling module, and a testing apparatus" as recited in claim 52. must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2,4,6-15 ,39-48 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree et al (Pat # 5,424,652) in view of Pryor et al (Pat # 4,712,161) and Long et al (Pat # 5621333 ).

As to claims 1,4,10,13,14,15,42-45 and 51-52, Hembree et al disclose an apparatus for testing a die (24) as shown in figures 2-3 having an interposer (14) with a ceramic substrate (14A) with an outmost surface and being configured for receiving thereon the semiconductive device (24) such that the device lies at least in part of the outermost surface and is unimbedded into the substrate (14),electrical conductors (14B) on the substrate (14) with receiving ends connected to the electrical leads (20) of the semiconductive device (24) with terminal ends (opposite ends of the receiving ends) connected to a testing apparatus. As to claim 8, Long et al teach that it would have been well known for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an insulated layer (20) on top of a conductor (22). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary

skill in the art to provide an insulated layer on the conductors of Hembree et al as taught by Long et al so that it can be used for preventing the conductors from making contact with other conductors or for heat dissipation. As to claims 2,6-7,9,11-12,39-41 and 46-48, Pryor et al teach that the material for the ceramic substrate such as Alumina, glass or boron nitrides are well known in the art. It would have been well known in the art to make the substrate of Hembree et al using the material of Pryor et al. Furthermore, the insulating materials for the substrate would have been also well-known in the art and these materials would also considered as alternative materials since Applicants have not established significant features for these materials.

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/10/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It appears that Applicant's remarks are more in details than the claim language.

First of all, it appears that the interposer (14) with a substrate (14A) has electrical conductors (14B) as shown in figure 2 has terminal ends and receiving ends connected to the semiconductive device (24) at the conductive terminals (20) of the device (24). It appears that both ends and terminals are on the same planar surface of the substrate (14). It is noted that the conductive terminals (20) are not considered by Examiner as "receiving ends" or "terminals".

Secondly, from Figure 3, it appears that this interposer (14) is electrically connected to a

housing (10) and the leads (28) by bonded wires (26). This combination of the housing, the bonded wires and the leads is considered as "an electrical apparatus.

Thirdly, it appears that the interposer (14) is removable since everything is removable and this interposer (14) is supported by the electric apparatus.

It is noted that the term "electric apparatus" is a broad term, therefore an apparatus has electrical connectors would qualified as "an electric apparatus".


6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2829

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VINH P. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 305-4914.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

  
VINH P. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2829

12/12/2002